The Obsession With Authenticity: Criticism To Dean MacCannell

Maximiliano E. Korstanje[1]

ABSTRACT

Tourism fields has emphasized recently in the indiscipline noted according to the existent studies. For some scholars, this was and is the reason why tourism has not been yet maturated as a serious discipline. Paradoxically, one of the most cited and founding parents of sociology of tourism seems to gain merit in that. The obsession of Dean MacCannell for authenticity and his pejorative view of tourism, as a simple industrial activity, led some studies to biased conclusions which trivialized tourism in last decades. Under this context, the present essays review not only explores the contradictions of D. MacCannell but also re-considers how the needs of protections are functional to the limens, or the dialectics of borders, imposed by Empires. At some extent, our thesis is that staged authenticity work is based on an old European decynonomic ethnocentrism that considers Europe as an evolved culture, whose styles are refined but corrupted, while primitive cultures are seen as pristine, pure, and unpolished. This prejudice coined by the anthropology through XIXth century still persists in tourism literature up to date.

RESUMO

Recentemente, o campo do turismo tem enfatizado a indisciplina verificada nos estudos sobre a temática. Para alguns acadêmicos, essa foi e é a razão pela qual o turismo ainda não teria alcançado a maturidade exigida às disciplinas, para que sejam vistas como sérias. Paradoxalmente, um dos mais citados na área e pai da sociologia do turismo, parece ganhar mérito por isso. A obsessão de Dean MacCannell pela autenticidade e sua visão pejorativa do turismo, para ele uma simples atividade econômica, levou alguns estudos a conclusões equivocadas, que banalizaram o turismo nas últimas

---

[1] Doutor. Department of Economics, University of Palermo, Argentina. E-mail: maxikorstanje@fibertel.com.ar

décadas. Sob este contexto, a revisão realizada neste ensaio não só expõe as contradições de MacCannell , mas também reconsidera as necessidades de proteção aos limiares, ou a dialética de fronteiras, impostas pelos Impérios. Em alguma medida, nossa tese é a de que a autenticidade encenada, trabalhada por MacCannell , baseia-se no velho etnocentrismo, que considera a Europa como uma cultura evoluída, cujo estilo refinado é corrompido, enquanto as culturas primitivas são vistas como primárias e puras, embora sem polimento. Esse preconceito cunhado pela antropologia do século XIX ainda persiste, na literatura sobre o turismo.

INTRODUCTION

The problems and limitations for tourism to become a scientific discipline can be traced to the view anthropology developed in past of this activity. Its connection with authenticity and culture paved the ways for the advent of numerous studies that focused on tourism in a pejorative manner. The origin of this misunderstanding, of course, has been the book of D. MacCannell, the tourist. Even though, this American sociologist has certainly gained reputation in last decades, because in some way he contributed to expand the understanding of how a sacralised site works, the fact is that his theory rests on shaky foundations. Not only, MacCannell did not understand the structuralism, but also presented a collage to consider the world in two opposite, urbanism and primitivism. Functional to the managerial and marketing goals, MacCannell development undoubtedly transformed the view of tourism but in the incorrect way. At some extent, he delved into a hedonist and negative theory of tourism that today has its costs. Under such a conjuncture, the present essay emphasizes, from a sociological perspective, the errors most important in MacCannell ´s work as well as explains the reasons why tourism is not deemed a valid academic alternative by other existent social sciences. Proponents of staged-authenticity paradigm emphasized on how the presence of tourists exerts considerable pressure to alienate the indigenous arts. This phenomenon has been widely studied in the specialized literature (Dann, 2005; Helpburn, 2002; Azeredo & Grunewald, 2002; Wickens, 2002; Lane & Waitt, 2007; Haug et al, 2007; Belhassen, Caton & Stewart, 2008), how less attention was given to the theory of authenticity as it was forged. Basically, MacCannell is interesting in knowing how to improve the attractiveness of destinations; involuntarily his view takes from sacredness and authenticity valid contributions that helped to policy-makers to exploit the culture, codifying the heritage in a product.

PRELIMINARY DEBATE

From a superficial perspective, tourism might be understood as both an economic activity and a psycho-social activity (de Kadt, 1992; Jimenez Guzman, 1986) whose implications have been little explored or publicised by comparison with other disciplines. On the other hand, it is also the case that each discipline (management, geography, psychology, sociology, for example) has proposed a different model for the study and resolution of tourism-related problems in the field. For some, tourism is a simple activity with well-defined geopolitical and economic roots (Heytens, 1978) while for others it is an immensely complex activity which merits inter-disciplinary study. Without doubt, tourism is associated to two psychological necessities, a

search for novelty, and for rest, both of whose origins might be studied from a biblical point of view. Judeo-Christian cosmology has been the ideological and mythical basis of tourism, as on the one hand it promotes curiosity as a form of renovation or the search for a new situation (sin and confession), while on the other it promotes travel as a form of rest.

Segui-Linas suggests that one of the first to develop the idea of the science of tourism or 'touristology' was Georges Cazes, who promoted the disciplinary study of tourism from various perspectives – namely the regional analysis of tourism, the relation between tourism and the developing world, and the epistemology of tourism. Cazes, like many others, was concerned to create a science which would unify the technical and scientific perspectives on tourism – which would unite the profit motive of investors, and the 'science' of tourism. As for regional analysis, Cazes focussed on the development and expansion of the tourist industry in the Mediterranean in the middle of the twentieth century. The French geographer was also concerned about the negative effects of tourism on under-developed countries. The epistemological perspective examined the influence of tourism flows on the natural environment (Segui-Llinas, 2006). However, Cazes falls into the same error as the majority of scholars as he assumes tourism development to be an epistemological rule (produced by the theory of the method of knowledge).

At present, there are two clear tendencies. The first is the 'technical perspective', the objective of which is to use the study of tourism as a tool, or as an instrument by which we can resolve certain incongruence in the system. This is a type of corrective method which tries to involve as many of the actors involved in tourism as possible in a synergic way. One of the distinctive characteristics of such research is the absence of a critical conscience towards the object of study, and the necessity to improve the present situation by the efficient organization of resources. The second is the 'scientific perspective' which tries to explain the reason and mechanism for the origin and development of the phenomenon of tourism. Although the scientific perspective, like the technical, is inspired by the desire to improve the quality of life of people, the priority is to validate or refute results, rather than giving any judgment during the process. The conclusion is the final result of the process. From this perspective, unlike the technical perspective, it is not important to make a value judgment as to what is, or should be, socially correct, but to study with objectivity how a phenomenon has evolved through time. Thus, we have the need to speak of 'sustainable tourism' (Jafari, 2005; Nadeau et al, 2008; Alvarez & Korzay, 2008; Franch et al, 2008). However, the influence of mercantilism and the Physicocratic School are still present in the technical tradition. The scientific perspective uses this mercantilism to criticize the technical perspective.

Santana-Talavera (2006) is not mistaken when he states:

> […] tourism has been developed within the necessity for economic, social, cultural and political expansion of western or westernized societies, as only these societies generate the formation and generation of economic surplus above survival needs which is essential for tourism. This surplus encourages the development of communications and voluntary human movement as an escape valve from the stresses created within these societies. As a form of using leisure time, tourism refers to mass travel which is undertaken voluntarily for pleasure, recreation, or simply a desire to stay in a certain place. Tourism as we understand it has its origin in curiosity, snobbishness, illness and the search for different weather conditions […] but only becomes a stable part of life when businessmen start to charge for offering a service (pp.19-20).

FROM THE CULTURE TO TOURISM

A piece like *The Tourist* of D. MacCannell still is in an interesting invitation to debate in regards to the existent relationship between tourism, culture and leisure class. This latter neologism was a term coined by the American economist T. Veblen. However, Veblen was not certainly interested in analyzing tourism related issues. Why MacCannell used this term to construct his theory?

In recent years, many scholars devote considerable attention in examining the encounter between hosts and guests as well the role played by authenticity and staged destination in the process of *touristification*. Inspired by an Iranian student who declared 'we all are tourists' in a classroom, MacCannell repeatedly examined how globalization transformed the social bondage and the way of consuming. This means that current consumers are a product of a previous digital revolution that changed the references of what can be called authenticity. In fact, this book seems to be dedicated to the influences of Frank Young whose contributions were aimed at delving into the interrelation between untangled macro social networks and cultural issues.

On an introductory chapter, MacCannell argues that tourism is resulted from an elaborated process of evolution that characterized the life of West. This observation immediately raises a question hard to respond ¿what is a tourist?. The tourist may be defined not only as a physical person (agent) but also as a macro-sociological construal. The former refers to those people who travel beyond their home looking for escapement in sparsely populated areas. Rather, the latter one may be considered in accordance to the advance of modernization. The question of consumption and culture are inextricably intertwined. The division of space and time as well as our own way of perceiving travels vary on economical order. In the late modernity, travels are conceived in opposition to primitive cultures. The leisure works as an elaborated mechanism of alienation, enrooted in the logic of capitalism. With basis on the influences of Claude Lévi-Strauss and Emile Durkheim´s contributions, MacCannell intends to create a bridge between symbolism and structuralism to define first what is tourism and how it operates in the world of consumption. In other words, the attractiveness that characterizes the tourist-destinations should be examined in comparison with the tribal totemnism of aborigines. Starting from the premises that aborigines identify themselves with a certain Totem, MacCannell argues that modern citizens have certainly made of consumerism a symbolic pattern of cultural identification.

However, these types of consumptions are far away of being authentic. Of course, an idea of this magnitude has been proposed by many others scholars before than MacCannell but he had the ability to combine different previous works into a coherent frame. One can realize that a feeling of immense gratitude is owed to MacCannell due to his critical contributions in the research of social fragmentation. As a previously mentioned, some credits are on MacCannell because in a moment whenever almost all studies have been drawn attention in outlining the economical benefits of tourism, he emphasized on the problems of many residents in accessing to wealth distribution and poverty relief. Hints to such effect prompted this scholar to affirm that tourism replicates the preexistent material asymmetries in developing countries which embrace tourism as a first economical option.

In perspective, this dialogic model takes human interaction dedicating concern to social relations and their influence of individual behavior. Basically, MacCannell examines how the process of modernity commoditizes sites, spaces, times and habits to be visually consumed by

others. The desire is of paramount importance to explain the postmodern world. The decline of Nation-state and workforce is one of the issues addressed in his book. Particularly, he makes the correct thing in denouncing the modernity and revealing its effects on aesthetic, first of all, the pervasive nature of power which coverts he significance of events. Based on the assumption it is important to re-construct an episteme of attractiveness, his development provides with some guidelines to understand 'the tourist' as a mega-narrative.

Nonetheless, MacCannell ´s thesis rests on shaky foundations. One of the first problems of his development is that the structuralist-method initially created by Levi-Strauss was inadequate to be applied in modern societies. Once and once again throughout this book MacCannell needs to make distance from Levi Strauss. These limitations led him to E. Goffman's phenomenology which focused on the connection between the world of work in opposition to leisure. Goffman viewed that the daily life can be compared to a theatre. At the front-state, the self will work to control and impress others performing its personal goals. Similarly to theatrical performances Goffman admits that people do not show authentic attitudes in social life. At a back-stage, people preserve their emotions about themselves and their connection with others. Following this explanation, there will be a dichotomy between what persons say and do.

Starting from the assumption people always lie, the covert ethnography is the only instrument that validates scientific research. MacCannell re-elaborates, how Goffman conceived the social bondage, arguing that the late capitalism has been created two opposed realms: *Archaism vs. modernism*. Whereas aborigines maintain their customs and tradition proper of archaism, the late modernity debates in a substantial ongoing social change. This romantic view paved the ways for seeing in tourism an activity enrooted in hedonism and superficiality. Secondly, the problems of structuralism was that many of the tourism-related researchers who adopted Macannell´s thesis are not anthropologist and are not familiar with the details of the mythical archetypes nor Levi-Strauss´s work.

For readers who whishing have this more clear, let us remind that structuralism imposed a model that understands the culture (as the language) is a dichotomy between two contrasting meanings. The inventory of cultures will facilitate for anthropology to create a periodic tables to determine the psychological behavior. By means of comparison of cultures, Levi Strauss envisaged an all-encompassed model to understand the man. If the language was created by means of binomial constructions as black/white, woman/man, high/low, the culture is based on the interpretation of the divergence. The process of identity of certain group is constructed in opposition to its neighbors. Following this, cultures are formed by two half parts, which are interconnected but works in opposition. This thesis is adapted by MacCannell who considers that the same happens with the relationship between leisure and work. While aborigines devoted times and efforts to the work, modern societies elicited elaborated forms of consumption associated to leisure. The aborigines are profound while tourists superfluous. For giving further validity to this idea, the American sociologist recurs to the theory of alienation in Marx.

In the first chapters of his book, MacCannell said that Marx was a pioneer in understanding the structuration between production and agents. For Marx, any society portraits an idealized image of itself. This types of projection is explained by means of the different frustration happened in the process of production. The modern economy is subject to a set of diverse contradictions as poverty and suffering, in order for the system not to be fragmented, the ideology provides to citizens a good reason to take part of capitalism. The idea of a staged-

paradise (heaven) not only sublimates human deprivations but also works as ideological mechanism in order for status quo not to loose its legitimacy. Once again, in MacCannell´s development, tourism is presented as a narcotic that gives ecstasy to consumers, a false sentiment of happiness that emptied the social trust. The tourist experience plays a pivotal role in configuring the tourism industry. It may be detached in three key factors: a) a model (stereotype) that draws the landscapes to impress sight-seers (depiction), b) persons and their emotions that determine the experience of self, and c) the agent who creates a bridge between experience with stereotypes and depiction.

MacCannell considers that tourism commoditizes the human suffering in forms of products that makes from poverty the main attraction. The question as to whether visitors are attracted by misfortune of others seems to be present in the entire book. Unlike travelers, tourists are indifferent by the suffering of others. This lack of sensibility is a product of alienation that transforms the curiosity proper of our specie in cynicism. How can we understand alienation?. MacCannell thesis points out that the leisure revitalizes the conflicts produced by the work. Tourist destinations are characterized not only by a lack of criticism upon the economical order but also subordinate the logic of work to the leisure. In other words, modern work-force seems not to be associated to its power of negotiation with owners, but also its accessibility to consumption. In ancient times, leisure was an alternative to emancipate of work, tourism in modernity combines the logic of pleasure and duties. The work set the pace to consumption and leisure where workers are the attraction, the product.

In a way that MacCannell does not explain properly, the late-modernity poses in tourism a way of alienating the daily practices. Unless otherwise resolved, the visual allegory becomes in a buzzy-word to describe how the modernity commoditizes human beings. Captivated by our gaze, the classical apparatus of production has been virtualized to the extent to create signs who serve as mediators between agents and their structures. Last but not least, MacCannell dwells on the influence exerted by tourism as an instrument of development for countries with limited resources in their economies. To a major or lesser degree, this industry plays a pivotal role in the revitalization of cultural and natural assets of a region. To here, we have synthesized the main contributions of Dean MacCannell in the understanding of negative effects of tourism as well as how work the process of *touristification*. Orchestrating previous works of classical founding parents of sociology and anthropology such as Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, Erving Goffman and of course T. Veblen, one of the credits of MacCannell lies in alternating different theses (as pieces) and framing them into a coherent body of knowledge which originally has been inspired to other scholars. However, we found serious problems in the articulation of these divergent theses that should be at least revisited. In next lines we will put under the lens of scrutiny the most polemical points of MacCannell theory about leisure class, tourism and staged-authenticity.

At a first glance, Marx surmised erroneously that history was defined as a continuum moved by the force of work. The cultural differences of societies were not determined by production, as Marx put it, but also by adaptancy to environment. Secondly, the role of conflict, very important to the evolution of history and well explained in Marxian theory is ignored in MacCannell´s work. Marx realized that the dialectic of conflicts (understood as a inter-class clash) was certainly perpetuated once oppressors lost the throne. Broadly speaking, the conflict is a dispute between classes for centralizing the necessary resources for surviving; in addition each point of conflict among societies triggers to winners in a new stadium of evolution. Underpinned on the belief the capitalism represented the last stadium of evolution, Marx envisaged that the classes struggle would lead humanity towards the end of conflict

(history) wherein it would rule the peace and cooperation. Having seen, rural societies can be overwhelmed by capitalist ones, in 1948 from New York Marx supported United States in war with Mexico. An agrarian country like Mexico will have no opportunity to USA. Needless to say a prophesy like the end of conflict was never fulfilled. However, it implicitly legitimated the expansion of capitalism through the world. MacCannell not only does not explore this contradiction of alienation theory but also keep on connecting Marx with Durkheim. Similarly to Marx, Durkheim saw in patriotism a legacy of religion. He thought that European countries were gradually evolving in elaborated structures that disconnected the belief with practices. West was the result of years of evolution respecting to Melanesia and other primitive cultures. The question of democracy, which accelerated the production times, paved the ways for the advent of secularization and social fragmentation. If totemnism, in primitive mind, has been petrified in pastime, the modernity opened the doors for future. By understanding the Melanesian religion, scholars would have insight of other much broader and complex institutions as nationalism and democracy. Since Durkheim never took appearance in Australia, his thesis was invalidated by several scholars in anthropology and ethnology. Even, Durkheim was recently accused to manipulate in his favor an amount of 42 over 100 original quotations in Spencer and Gillen in the study of Melanesian tribes (Serrano, 2000).

To be honest, the cases of Goffman and Levi Strauss are less polemical than utopian Marx or Durkheim. It is safe to say that Goffman's participation and contact with G. Mead played an important role to the inception of dramaturgical methodology. As previously explained, Goffman realized human interaction was unauthentic because it was determined by egoism and personal interests. Goffman was seriously criticized because his assumption was exaggerated. Under some circumstances, the encounter of self with others follows a criterion of respect and cooperation. MacCannell once again is wrong when he advice that tourism is based on a false encounter between hosts and guests. Furthermore, the goffmanian dramaturgy was attacked because this stance represented unethical goals. People cannot be studied or observed without previous notice. Last but not least, MacCannell cites repeatedly the intervention of Levi Strauss in modern ethnography. Of course, the father of structuralism dedicated an important part of his life in understanding the cultural differences among tribal archetypes. Structuralism is almost a method based on the examination of myths. For French structuralists, myths were forms of intellectualizing the discrepancies between culture and death. Aimed at reconciling contrasting values, myths serve as guidelines in times of uncertainty (see further about levi-straussian works on Percival and Oedipus myths). Most certainly, Levi-Strauss considered not only Durkheim but also Malinowski misjudged the role of totemnism in primitive culture (Levi-Strauss, 2003).

 A clear example will help us to better understand this matter. One of the deeper concerns of human-kind is the question of immortality. Since the first day of life, time is running and people are next to death. In the rites of baptism not only converges the fear of death with fertility but also the need of protecting the child until its adulthood. These rites remind attendants how possible the deaths of children are. Whatever the case may be, Levi-Strauss argues convincingly that myths are politic construes whose function is aimed at preserving the societal order (Peirano, 2000; Leach, 1954, 1965), but these myths cannot be compared or studied beyond the social practice. It is impossible to make a periodic table of myths or cultures imply because the connection between two mythical structures does not denote scientific correlation. One of detractors of Levi-Strauss, M. Douglas criticized the possibility to see myths and cultures as simple objects. In this token, not only myths may be studied if ethnographer pays attention to practices in the field, but also it is in vain to compare two structures in abstract. Moreover, two tribes may develop similar institutions simply because

both developed the same adaptancy to environment. Cultures are not artifacts, but human reactions to lively adapted to a certain time and site (Douglas, 1996). The following example will clarify further about Douglas's view. In Sweden and Norway, Saxon and Lampoons have shared not only similar myths or customs but also their eyes are blue and hair blond. This resemblance seems not to be associated to a pervious ethnic-familiarity but also to question of environmental adaptation. Indeed, while Lampoons linguistically stems from the North-American aboriginal family (as Navajo), Saxons remains from indo-european ethnicity. This example evidences, Douglas adds, the controversy of structuralism because this position misunderstands the role of social practices in cultures.

Our main thesis here is that MacCannell has been taken the more polemic side of each one of the theories he focused not only by avoiding the discussion along with their limitations but also tergiversating their meaning per his own convenience. The present review explored throughout the main limitations of D. MacCannell and his interpretation of previous works of Durkheim, Marx, Goffman and Levi-Strauss. For some reason, the book *The tourist, a new theory of leisure class* has been broadly cited by scholars of the four corners of the world in tourism and hospitality fields, and his contributions have never been re-examined in the line of a critique perspective. For that reason, we strongly believe the present review reopen a question that has been covered, the theoretical inconsistencies in the definition of what a staged-authenticity mean. As earlier stated, the consequent errors in MacCannell ´s interventions resulted in the existent obsession for authenticity. If tourism is viewed as an alienable and superfluous activity, its possibility to be a scientific discipline is slim.

E. Cohen showed in the fields how the representations may be studied following easier guidelines than proposed by MacCannell. The sense of reality and representation are not enough to explain the tourist experience. The six stages of authenticity have been placed under the lens of scrutiny by other researchers (Castano, 2005). Azeredo-Grunewald brings the attention to the factors that determines the authenticity of some object, sacralization, but delves into those who are de-sacralized. The Brazilian anthropologist argued that under some circumstances, aborigines manipulates the sense of object in their own favor, to be offered and commercialized to tourists. Rather, unlike MacCannell , the encounter between hosts and guest is negotiated according to the benefits of both. The process of *touristification* does not engender social conflicts neither fragmentation for residents unless their autonomy to be threatened. Azeredo-Grunewald dissociates the tourist-arts from ethnic-arts. The former are screened only at the disposal of tourist-gaze while the latter confers the socialization values to natives. Giving this point of discussion, the dissociation between staged-authenticity and authenticity not only seems to be inadequate but also gives more problems than solutions (Azeredo Grunewald, 2002a, 2002b). Last but not least, Pearce and Moscardo (1985) suggested reviewing the contributions of structuralism because it trivializes the importance of social interaction in tourist destinations. The illusory nature of a destination is based on how the involving actors interacts each others, not by mega-structural factors. The front or back stages to figure the social life is not only insufficient but also confusing, impossible to be validated in empirical-research. Since 30 years of investigation on, MacCannell waked up reluctance and admiration in detractors and proponents. Because of space, it is almost impossible to review all bibliography based on MacCannell ´s work here, but it is important not to lose the sight the classic studies such as K. Marx, E. Goffman and Levi-Strauss. This paper explores the primary conceptual contradictions of structuralism, limitations that ultimately engendered a biased concern by authenticity and culture.

CULTURAL OBSESSION: CRITICISM TO D. MACCANNELL

Methodologically, tourism researchers into these impacts use surveys, interviews and focus groups as their preferred data collection techniques. There is almost consensus in assuming that what people say to interviewers has a certain scientific validity, but in fact there is often a great difference between what they say and what they do. If the sustainability of a tourism destination can be determined purely by the opinions of tourists, other actors and data collection methods are discarded because they are considered not to be representative of reality. This conceptual error means that tourism has serious deficiencies when developing its own methodology, comparable in status to other academic disciplines. Sharpley and Sundaram (2005), for example, emphasize the importance of spirituality in rural tourism. From the earliest beginnings, tourism should be seen as a sacred voyage whose memories come from pilgrimage and religious fervour. Even if the theoretical basis depends on the problem to be studied, the methodological perspectives suggest exploring the motivations of those who undertake pilgrimages to ashrams in India. Though the study does not concern the economic effects of tourism, this spiritual perspective confronts two fundamental problems. Firstly, it does not clarify the scientific distinction between an explanation of the first order and one of the second order. Contrary to those scientific studies which formulate an explanation of the causes which provoke a phenomenon, market research emphasizes the desires of the customer without taking into account the psycho-social factors of the subject under discussion. Secondly, even the consumers themselves are often unaware of the causes of their attitudes and therefore recur to second-order explanations (established in the questionnaires) to guide their own answers. As a result, the researcher not only determines the questionnaire, but also the answers of the interviewees. If academics claim that cultural tourism is beneficial for the formation of identity, and this idea is inserted into the questionnaire, the subject of an interview will have no hesitation in confirming the affirmation. However, neither the interviewee nor the interviewer can break the logic of the second-order explanation, and will then fall into proposing false hypotheses (known to sociologists as ecological fallacies). This form of undertaking research sets the stage for reproducing forceful ideas and prejudices arising from the imagination, in areas as diverse as tourism and culture, up to the idea that 'immigrants bring illnesses with them'.

There is an extensive bibliography at present linking tourism with sustainability and the search for the genuine. Initially, this was a matter of concern to D. MacCannell who was one of the founding fathers of the sociology of tourism. The dichotomy between the sacred and the profane created two valid categories for understanding modern tourism. However, the idea of considering tourists as members of the 'leisure class' is due to misinterpretation by some of the followers of MacCannell. Those who have had the opportunity to read the works of Veblen will realize that he makes no reference to 'tourists', but rather to the opposite. Veblen discusses the 'intellectuals' as social remnants of the priestly classes who controlled the ancient and medieval world (Veblen, 1974). For D. MacCannell there is an analogous relationship between the leisure class and the modern tourist. According to this perspective:

1) Cultures are understood as structures with greater or lesser consistency and strength.

2) There are stronger and weaker cultures.

3) The meeting between culturally superior and inferior groups leads to admiration and submission (MacCanell, 1988).

4) There is a tendency to consider human relations as not being authentic.

5) One can observe a false dichotomy between the industrial world and the tribal world.

6) Tribal societies tend to be idealized, and considered to be integrated, free of conflicts, and without distinction between public and private spaces.

7) Being influenced by C. Levi-Strauss, the author confuses the limitations of the construction 'significance-significant' applied to the background for tourism (MacCannell, 2003).

In part because it is dogmatic, and in part because it is incomplete, the theory of authenticity should be reformulated. In another recent work (Korstanje, 2009c) criticized the influence of Dean MacCannell, considering it to be incorrect for the following reasons:

1) In spite of the warning of Levi-Strauss about the impossibility of using structuralism to study modern urban phenomena such as tourism, MacCannell insists on using structuralism as a form of comparison between the sacred (and primitive) and the secular (and modern). His readings concerning the leisure class of Veblen are incorrect, as for an economist, tourists did not contemplate the formation of a leisure class. The relationship between leisure and tourism is thus a forced relationship.

2) The goffmanian methodology applied by MacCannell, using under-cover observation in the field, contradicts all the accepted ethical standards for any scientific discipline, as the person being observed has not been previously notified, reducing his own autonomy to the level of a mere object.

3) The dichotomy of authenticity versus non-authenticity is a false dichotomy, as this is conditioned by the role of the traveler, and his previous experiences and cognitive structures.

4) Levistraussian structuralism has serious problems in explaining why certain human groups do not have any ethnic relationship. Two mythological structures might resemble each other, but only because of environmental adaptation. The resemblance does not imply a scientific cause-effect correlation.

One of the characteristics of modernity is the progressive emptiness of the sense of space, and the decline of social relations. Organized industrial capitalism has been replaced by disorganized capitalism which has no concept of hierarchies but rather of abstract networks for the exchange of services between the centre and the periphery. For Lash and Urry, while the symbol was constituted as a private version of space whose characteristics are hierarchical and structural, the allegory worked through hermeneutics and aesthetical reflection. This breaks with the romantic idea of the community to install a space which constantly produces itself. However, this division does not signify a total emptiness, but a new configuration which is determined by the decline of social ties. The power of the imagination appears in the social life of the subject, reducing the status of all its institutions and the reach of Cartesian space. We can see the same in the work of MacCannell who in error insists on the thesis of alienation from post-modernist logic. In reality, tourism and modern leisure are formed of compartments where individuals might express their emotions which have been 'repressed' in social life and daily work.

The sociologist from the USA considers that a tourism visit is a ritual which tries to recover, in one unique experience, different fragments of modernity. The traveler is looking for an authenticity which helps them to conquer the alienation of which they are a product, but, far from this, tourism subsumes them in a reality which they themselves have created (an

impossible voyage). The tourism experience, on return from the voyage, is characterized by the re-affirmation of the stereotypes held before leaving. In this sense, the role of tradition in the modern cultural industry is subordinate to the nostalgic caprices of the tourist, which must be fulfilled. Thus, the link between the visitor and his host becomes impersonal, fragile and ritualistic (MacCanell, 2003); it becomes a type of emptiness of the sense of space.

Last but not least, it is impossible to promote the protection of local landscapes without noting the logic and basis of imperialism have certainly changed. M. Hardt and A. Negri (2003) argue convincingly, left-scholars precluded that local culture based on tradition and authenticity should reverse the negative effects of globalization. Rather, the dichotomy global vs. local not only seems to be false, but also covers the enemy legitimizing the real nature of Empire. One of the aspects that characterize the surface of bio-politics and the dialectics of border is the lack of revolutions. Since communities have no connection with others, simply because they are trapped by the bubble of authenticity, the biodiversity is subject to the hegemony of capital. Today, landscapes and entire territories are fabricated, virtualized, commoditized and consumed by a segmented demand particularly designed in centre. The periphery only should be limited to receive and protect the tourists.

The dependency of nations respecting to globalized capital is unquestionable whatever the view may be. Following this reasoning, Negri and Hardt (2002) acknowledge that the sovereignty of Empire is displaced towards the boundaries. This new Empire intervenes inside the national domain whenever the financial order is under threat. As the previous argument given, democracy and politics have been subordinated to the economic interests of ruling global elites. In order for keep the order in this mobile system, capitalism has developed a net of corruption which prevents the growth of desire. Corruption plays a vital role in the process of domination in the age of bio-politics to the extent to control the social discontents and protests. Basically, the economic exploitation of labor unions is a way of corruption simply because it corresponds with a sign of immobilization. In past, the classical industrial societies created a chain of value in their local economies, and of course workers were very important in this process. However, things changed a little and now, the value is determined by the system, and workers are commoditized in mere products. Whether the labor unions threaten the stability of capitalism, the senses of terror and safety adjusts the asymmetries in favor of greater business corporations (Negri & Hardt, 2003). At some extent, although authors do not say this explicitly, we might affirm that terrorism seems to be the worker unions by other means. The obsession for authenticity is nowadays what anthropology was for the colonialism of XIXth century. This slippery matter will be discussed in depth in the next lines.

THE OBSESSION FOR PROTECTING AUTHENTICITY OR THE CYNICISM OF CAPITALISM

From the Social Sciences, undoubtedly there is no other sub-discipline more advocated to study culture and ecology than anthropology (their breakthroughs are unquestionable) but not less truth was that the history of anthropology showed a close connection with imperialism and ethnocentrism. This does not mean of course that these disciplines were functional to the European imperialism thru XIXth and XXth centuries, anyway suspicions of collaboration between anthropology and Colonial officers has been well documented by Marvel Harris (2006). In this section, we will explore the onset of paternalism created by anthropology thru XIXth century as well as the European paradigm that precludes the otherness should be protected.

Amidst XIXth century, the main powers of Europe launched to colonize different strategic points of the globe in order for them to improve the existent conditions of life. In doing so, central countries have taken military presence in their colonies. This encounter with other non-white cultures generated a serious curiosity in some scholars (ethnologists) who were initially recruited with the end of bettering the colonial administrations. Therefore, the historical liaison between anthropology and colonialism were inextricably intertwined. The conceptual differences between civilized and primitive societies were one of the primary aspects that drew the attention of social anthropology. The field-work, a technique created by B. Malinowski, allowed incorporating a set of new elements not only useful for the advance of science, but also for the knowledge of colonies. Most certainly, anthropology based its theoretical framework on two beliefs: a) whether scholars do not collate all artifacts, customs and cultural expressions sooner, aborigine culture ran serious risks to be gone by the advance of modernity; b) there was a tendency to consider the European societies as civilized, anomic but complex, while local cultures were defined as pristine, primitive and irrational. The juxtaposition of these ideas gave as a result a pervasive paternalism which for one hand prioritized the security of aborigines but for the other, subordinated their style of life to Western education (Racdliffe-Brown, 1975; Malinowski, 1986)

Often associated to a lack of writing skills and rationale, aborigines were considered inferior and weaker than Western cultures. Whilst European writers drew a romanticized aborigines and primitive cultures in harmony with nature, the development showed to be in conflict with the idea of ecology. The nature was self-oriented to be dominated by the advanced-cultures but this entailed a cost. The sense of emancipation and happiness, in this period of time, was promptly interlinked to the possibility to enjoy from environment outdoors paving the pathways for the emergence of the 'privilege of escapement'. Besides, the concept of culture, central to anthropology and ethnology, was certainly introduced to denote all encompassing human artifacts, customs, values, beliefs and myths which created a sense of identity and continuity in the threshold of time. In efforts for understanding the behaviors of otherness, there were serious problems to dissociate the scientific interests from the political context where first ethnologies were embedded in. As a product of English and German Romanticisms, anthropology and ethnology hoisted the 'good' cause of protection that not only endured up to date but also paved the pathways for the expansion of colonial order world-wide.

The rationale doctrine coined in Europe during Enlightenment gave as a result a pervasive sentiment that generated the concerns for protecting other cultures or forms of lives. Nonetheless, to protect anyone one should conceive oneself as superior. This type of sentiment should be often determined by a set of outstanding assets mutually negotiated between giver and taker. The idea that riches should help pours is not new, this comes from Christian church, but Enlightenment changes the European cosmology respecting to work and leisure. If the medieval scholars saw in work a negative aspect that denoted weakness, the Enlightenment conceived the work as a form of improvement and progress. This appraised evolution was possible thanks to the more elaborated ways of production and technology of Europe, which other cultures lacked. With the passing of years and after the Second World War, the concept of progress was coupled to a new term, the development. To be developed or not was indeed more than a form of hegemony, this converted in a priority for many States of West representing the preconditions for social distinction. Immediately this doctrine was disseminated thru the globe, the countries were cut in two; developed and underdeveloped nations. The promises of betterness for all pour countries were not only welcomed but also actively encouraged by industrialized ones. However this raised an more than interesting question ¿how can a nation start a project without the necessary capital for that?.

Most certainly, one of the aspects the theory for development failed to explain was the backwardness of many peripheral countries in spite of the financial aid given by international organisms and developed countries (Escobar, 1997; Esteva, 2000). Although this moot point is still being discussed among anthropologists in our days, it is important not to lose the sight that social change seems to be positive since improves the style of life of lay-people whose basic needs are unmet. The problem is that sometimes the ideology generates an economic dependence between nation-hoods. This happens because developing countries receive loans to higher interests that they are unable to accrue. As a result of this, the international financial organisms create a linkage of dependence reproducing some material asymmetries between First and third world (Rist, 1996). As early noted, development has polemically become in a troublesome aspect of economic growth. Detractors of development doctrine insisted that economic dependence not only is engendered by cross-cultural contact but also should be seen as a cultural construe coupled to globalization. Generally, modernity as well as globalization transcends the boundaries of nation-States encouraging a new synergy between interconnected communities under promises of betterness but at the same time such promises are certainly blurred in the fieldwork. To be more precise, historically the third world only was pushed to absorb the costs of growth in the north hemisphere. Whether in past periphery provided to center of commodities to erect their industries, now tourism and development played similar role by generating a high mobility of capital and persons. However, while the persons are mobile the capital remains accumulated in Europe and United States. By the influence exerted by Mass-media, pleasure and luxury are often exported from center to periphery in order for modifying the styles of life of colonized-countries. The needs of protecting environs were functional not only to the creation of a new Empire but also to the reproduction of capital.

Whether colonialism took the contributions of social anthropology to have success in its expansion, now neo-colonialism utilizes tourism in similar conditions. Of course, this does not mean necessarily that anthropology was an agent of colonization but at some extent, this discipline documented a set of customs and information that served to colonial officers. In the case of tourism, things seem to be pretty different. Tourism and hospitality do not provide information to central countries in a strict term of the word. Nonetheless, tourism coupled with development wake up in hosts a profound necessity to exploit their local resources. Since the infrastructure and the other assets that characterize a tourist-destination need of high investment of capital, local stakeholders are not able to head a process of *touristification* on their own end. This quandary is resolved by the intervention of financial organisms which warrant the success of the project.

Unearthing S. Zizek´s contributions, the ideology works as a dream mingling the reality from the fantasy. One of the most influential aspects of ideology is not necessarily the given message, but what it is silenced (ZIZEK, 2009). It is unfortunate that scholarship is of course enrooted in the belief that development not only generates employment but also reduces the gap between industrialized and unindustrialized countries (Viola, 2000). Following this, Schnapper argues that the exacerbation of efficacy and efficiency of State is linked to a need for centralizing certain material resources meanwhile others less important are privatized. The problem seemed to be the criteria followed to determine strategically what resources should be or not privatized (Schnapper, 1988). Many peripheral countries placed in hands of foreign investors strategic resources creating a new criterion of dependence. This reminds us undoubtedly that there are many subtle strategies for colonizing which are not debated in specialized literature. Most likely one of the major strength these strategies have are associated to the fact they are not placed under the lens of scrutiny by experts and scholars

concerned to sustainability issues, rather, they still encourage development and sustainability as vehicles towards happiness.

From its implementation, development stimulated a hot-debate worldwide. For detractors, development was simply a new policy to expand the liberal democracy and hegemony to developing countries. Rather, for others, the failures derived from the implementation of development programs were a simple result of cultural issues such as politic instability, corruption or lack of flexibility to adapt and compete in an ever-changing market. Many anthropologists were hired to valid this hypothesis during 1970 and 1980. Cultural anthropology, once again, became in an instrument for elites to legitimate their practices. Whatever the case may be, involving Financial Aid Organizations have never assumed their liabilities by the failure of these programs in Africa or even in Latin America (Cardelli & Rosenfeld, 1998). As a counter-response to the problems surfaced, U.S. and Europe delivered their experts to world-wide to advice officials as to how administrate the State efficiently. Programs of development were accompanied with a serious and strictly combination of economic steps the solicitant should fulfill. Privatization of strategic resources, adjustment in administrations to gain further efficacy in the administration of state have been some of the policies suggested by IMF and World Bank during 90s (Schnapper, 1988).

After further examination, Corbalan (2004) reminds how United States duplicated between 1980 and 1990 the assistance in loans to Latin America and Africa without any type of follow-up leaving interests circumscribed to the force of liberal-market. This creates some difficulties for developing countries and strengthened the previous bondage that characterized the cold-war. The old ideology of conquest based on racial disparities set the pace to the advent of 'governability' as main criterion that marks the boundaries between civilization and barbarity. It is not surprising that officials and government valorize the benefits of tourism because they preclude the economic success will provide with legitimacy to their administration. From that day onwards, many definitions of culture and ethnicity were discussed in academy but what seems to be most important is that ideology set the pace to tourism which adopted the paradigm of culture tourism as its primary concern. The times have changed, but discourses have really survived under other guises. Following this explanation, it is important to reconsider not only the legacy of anthropology but also how ideology worked and evolved in the threshold of time. S. Zizek argues that ideology exerts influence in daily life not necessarily by its message, nor discourse but precisely for what it occults (Zizek, 2009). It is unfortunate that nowadays the ecology takes the place given by development until 90s. The pour-nations envisaged in ecology a fertile ground to invest in next years. In this process, tourism will surely pivot once again. The degree of attractiveness that today is conferred to a tourist-destination is centered on two visual values: the wildlife, and the favor currency exchange. This means that tourists coming from central countries consume 'authenticity and ecology' offered by underdeveloped countries.

CONCLUSION

The idea that secularization brings with it emptiness to places is not only dangerous but also potentially ethnocentric as, if every place confers rights on its inhabitants, a non-place confers non-rights. If we assume that non-places are usually inhabited by people excluded from the economic system, then we can assume that they have neither rights nor legal personality. Paradoxically, the consumerism which MacCannell says is the principal problem of modernity

is the principal criterion for conferring rights and non-rights. The Spanish anthropologist Nogues-Pedregal is correct when he says that MacCannell, and his inconsistencies, have been responsible for the fact that many of the social sciences trivialize the scientific study of tourism, as they pre-define the activity as hedonistic and superficial consumerism of spaces, assuming, without any basis, 'that there is nothing authentic about modern tourism' (Nogues-Pedregal, 2009). Under the veil of ignorance, unfortunately many writers about tourism have adhered to the idea of MacCannell for two reasons. Firstly, for those outside the social sciences, it is very complex to understand the development of structuralist theory, and therefore it is impossible to appreciate the errors made by MacCannell. Secondly, the idea of developing a theory based on the relation between truth and falsehood (or hedonistic consumerism versus discovery) is thinking reminiscent of the Cold War and confrontation between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. The principle of sustainability developed by MacCannell has been counter-productive, as it has historically fed a new type of paternalism which connects tourism with 19th Century anthropology and colonization.

REFERENCES

Alvarez, M. & Korzar, M. (2008). Influence of politics and media in the perception of Turkey as a tourism destination. *Tourism Review,* V. 63, N. 2, pp. 38-46.

Azeredo-Grunewald, R. (2002a). Artes Turísticas e Autenticidade Cultural. *Veredas, revista Ciéntifica de Turismo.* Año 1, N.1, pp. 7-21.

Azeredo-Grunewald, R. (2002b). Tourism and Cultural Revival. *Annals of Tourism Research.* V. 29 (4), pp. 1004-1021.

Belhassen, Y; Caton, K & Stewart, P. (2008). The search for authenticity in the pilgrim experience. *Annals of Tourism Research.* V. 35 (3), pp. 668-689.

Castano, J.M. (2005). *Social Psychology of Travels and Tourism.* Madrid: Thomson Ed.

Cardarelli, G. & Rosenfeld, M. (1998). *Las participaciones de la pobreza: programas y proyectos sociales.* Buenos Aires: Editorial Paidos.

Cohen, E. (1979). Rethinking the sociology of Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research,* V.9, pp. 403-428.

Corbalan, M. A. (2004). Intervención y disciplinamiento: función política de los organismos internacionales de crédito. Ciclos, año XVI, V. XVI (27), pp.1-15.

Dann, G. (2005). The theoretical State of the State-of-the-Art in the sociology and anthropology of tourism. *Tourism Analysis.* V. 10, pp. 3-15.

Douglas, M. (1996). Animales anómalos y metáforas animales. En Estilos de Pensar, Barcelona: Gedisa.

Durkheim, E. (1992). *Las Formas elementales de la vida religiosa*. Madrid: Akal.

114

SPECIAL ISSUE – The Dialectics of Borders Empires and Limens
The Obsession with Authenticity: Criticism to Dean Maccannell

Escobar, A. (1997). Antropología y Desarrollo. *Revista Internacional de Ciencias Sociales*. N. 154. Unesco.

Escobar, A. (1995). Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World. Nueva Jersey: Princeton UP.

Esteva, G. (2000). Desarrollo. En Viola Andreu (Compilador). *Antropología del Desarrollo.* Barcelona: Editorial Paidos.

Franch, M. et al. (2008). El tourism (landscape, leisure, learning and limit) responding to new motivations and expectations of tourist to improbé the competitiveness of alpine destination in sustainable way. *Tourism Review,* V. 63, N.1,pp. 4-14.

Goffman, E. (2004). *La presentación de la persona en la vida cotidiana*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu Editores.

Haug, B et al. (2007). Little Norway in Spain. *Annals of Tourism Research.* V.34 (1), pp.202-222.

Hardt, M. & Negri A. (2003). *Empire.* Buenos Aires: Paidos.

Hardt, M. & Negri A. (2004). *Multitude. War and democracy in the age of Empire.* Barcelona: Debate.

Harris, M. (2006). *The Rise of Anthropological theory, a history of theories of Culture.* México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Helpburn, S. (2002). Tourist forms in life Nepal. *Annals of Tourism Research.* V.29 (3), pp. 611-630.

Heytens, J. (1978). Les Effects du Tourisme Dans les Pays en Vie de Développement. Implications Economiques. Financières et Sociales. *Les Cahiers du Tourisme*. Centre des Hautes Etudes du Tourisme. Provence: Universidad de Marsella.

Jafari, J. (2005). El Turismo como disciplina científica. Revista Política y Sociedad. V. 42, N. 1, pp. 39-56.

Jimenez-Guzman, L.F. (1986). *Teoría Turística: un enfoque integral del hecho social*. Bogotá: Universidad Externado de Colombia.

Korstanje, M. (2009). MacCannell em Perspectiva: análise critica sobre a obra El Turista. *RBTUR, Revista Brasileira de Pesquisa em Turismo*. V. 3, N. 3, pp. 80-111.

Lane, R & Waitt, G. (2007). Inalienable places. *Annals of Tourism Research.* V. 34 (1), pp. 105-121.

Leach, E. (1954). Political System of highland Burma. London: Bell.

Leach, E. (1954). *Levi-Strauss*, anthropologist and philosopher. Barcelona: Anagrama.

Levi-Strauss, C. (2003). *El Pensamiento Salvaje*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

_____

MacCannell, D. (1988). Turismo e Identidad cultural. En Todorov, T. *El Cruzamiento entre culturas*. Madrid, Ediciones Jucar.

MacCannell , D. (2003). *El Turista: una nueva teoría de la clase ociosa.* Barcelona: Melusina Ed.

MacCanell, D. (2007). *Lugares de Encuentro Vacío.* Barcelona: Melusina Ed.

Malinowski, B. (1986). *Los argonautas del Pacífico Occidental.* Barcelona: Editorial Planeta-Agostini.

Nadeau, J. et al. (2008). Destination in a country image context. *Annals of Tourism Research,* 35 (1), pp. 84-106.

nogues-pedregal, A. M. (2009). Genealogy of troublesome relationship between anthropology and tourism. *Pasos,* V. 7, N.1, pp. 43-56.

Pearce, P. L. & Moscardo, G. (1985). The concept of authenticity in tourism experiences. *Australian and New Zealand journal of Sociology.* V. 22, pp. 121-132.

Peirano, M G. (2000). *A Análise Antropológica de Rituais*. Serie de Antropología 270. Brasilia: UnB.

Racdileffe-Brown, A. (1975). *Estructura y función en la sociedad primitiva.* Barcelona: Editorial Península.

Rist, G. (1996). *Le développement histoire d une croyance occidentale.* Paris : Prensa de la Fundación Nacional de Ciencias Políticas.

Santana-Talavera, A. (2006). *Antropología y Turismo. ¿Nuevas hordas, viejas Culturas?.* Barcelona, Ariel.

Segui-Llinas, M. (2006). Hacia una Ciencia del Turismo: siguiendo los pasos de Georges Cazes. *Aportes y Transferencias*, V. 2, N.10, pp. 11-16.

Serrano, A.E. (2000). Las fuentes de Información que utilizó Emile Durkheim para sustentar la teoría de la función social. *Razón y palabra*. V. 18. Disponible en www.razonypalabra.org.mx

Sharpley, R. & Sundaram, P. (2005).Tourism: a sacred journey? The case of Ashram, Tourism India. *International Journal of Tourism Research,* V. 7, pp. 161-171.

Schnapper, D. (1988). Modernidad y Aculturaciones a propósito de los trabajadores emigrantes. En Todorov, T. *Cruce de Culturas y mestizaje cultural.* Madrid: Ediciones Jucar, pp. 173-205.

Veblen, T. (1974). *La Clase Ociosa.* México, Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Wickens, E. (2002). The sacred and profane- a tourist typology. *Annals of Tourism Research.* V. 29 (3), pp. 834-851.

Zizek S. (2009). *Violence.* Barcelona, Paidos.